

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,073	02/13/2004	Gabriel Pecouyoul	CELA:113	4140
6160	50 7590 09/16/2005		EXAMINER	
PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P. 1421 PRINCE STREET			KERSHTEYN, IGOR	
SUITE 210			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2805			3745	

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/777,073	PECOUYOUL, GABRIEL	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Igor Kershteyn	3745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was realiure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to the second will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	NN. imely filed m the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) □ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) □ This action is FINAL. 2b) □ This 3) □ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p		
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,3-6,8,9 and 11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 2,7,10 and 12-14 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies.	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/13/04,5/13/04	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:		

Art Unit: 3745

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 5, 7, and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the different components" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "said filter" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "said second plane wall" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "said second plane wall" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "said filter" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "said filter" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3745

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koomey (3,775,736) in view of Dixon (4,122,687).

Koomey teaches an electro-hydraulic generator 10 comprising a tank of hydraulic fluid 44 and a set of components comprising a motor 48 driving a hydraulic pump 46, an accumulator 30, means 36,38 to distribute the hydraulic fluid and means linking the different components, wherein the tank 44 and the components are inserted into a cylindrical volume delimited by a circular surface (not numbered), a second plane end face (not numbered), and in that the components are fastened to the tank 44, wherein the motor 48 is a direct current low voltage electric motor.

Koomey doesn't teach a first plane end face and an exchanger arranged according to the circular surface.

Dixon, in figures 5-7, teaches an electro-hydraulic generator inserted into a cylindrical volume delimited by a circular surface 18, and a first plane end surface 20.

Since Koomey and Dixon are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is the electro-hydraulic generator art, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the cylindrical volume of Koomey with the plane end surface as taught by Dixon for the purpose of stabilizing the generator assembly in a horizontal position and eliminating the any additional brackets.

Koomey does not teach an exchanger arranged according to the circular surface.

Art Unit: 3745

Dixon, in figures 5 and 6, teaches an exchanger 23 arranged according to the circular surface 18.

Since Koomey and Dixon are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is the electro-hydraulic generator art, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to equip the electro-hydraulic generator of Koomey with the exchanger arranged according to the circular surface as taught by Dixon for the purpose of maintaining the working fluid at desired temperatures to prevent overheating of the working fluid.

Claims 4, 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koomey (3,775,736) as modified by Dixon (4,122,687) in view of Gourlay et al. (3,357,179).

Koomey as modified by Dixon teach all the claimed subject matter except that they don't teach the filter fastened on the tank and partly or fully inserted into the tank.

Gouplay et al. in figure 8, teach an electro-hydraulic generator 10, having a tank 36, and a filter 58 fastened on the tank 36 and partly or fully inserted into the tank 36.

Since Koomey as modified by Dixon and Gourlay et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is the electro-hydraulic generator art, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to equip the electro-hydraulic generator of Koomey as modified by Dixon with the filter as taught by Gourlay et al. for the purpose of filtering the working fluid from contaminants.

Art Unit: 3745

Koomey as modified by Dixon don't teach the pump being immersed in the tank.

Gourlay et al., in figure 8, teach the pump 14 being immersed in the tank 36.

Since Koomey as modified by Dixon and Gourlay et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is the electro-hydraulic generator art, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the electro-hydraulic generator of Koomey as modified by Dixon with the immersed pump as taught by Gourlay et al. for the purpose of eliminating a suction line thus improving the condition of the suction port of the pump.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer (2,893,355) in view of Leathers et al. (3,015,254).

Bauer, in figures 1 and 2, teaches an electro-hydraulic generator 1 comprising a tank of hydraulic fluid 11 and a set of components comprising a motor 2 driving a hydraulic pump 10, an accumulator 164, means 4 to distribute the hydraulic fluid and means linking the different components, and in that the components are fastened to the tank 11, wherein said components and said filter 14 are fastened on a second plane wall, the motor 2 is a DC low voltage motor, said filter 14 is fully inserted in said tank, and a method to use the generator 1 to move at least one head assembly comprising an actuator 5 driving a shaft, integral with a turret head, in rotation.

Bauer doesn't teach the tank and the components are inserted into a cylindrical volume delimited by a circular surface, a first plane end face, a second plane end face.

Art Unit: 3745

Leathers et al., in figure 2B and column 1, lines 43-46, teach an electro-hydraulic

generator having the tank 38 and the components are inserted into a cylindrical volume

14 delimited by a circular surface (not numbered), a first plane end face 12, a second

plane end face (not numbered).

Since Bauer and Leathers et al. are analogous art because they are from the

same field of endeavor, that is the electro-hydraulic generator for turret heads art, it

would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to insert the electro-hydraulic generator of Bauer into the turret

head as taught by Leathers et al. for the purpose of power assisting in aiming a turret

gun.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 7, 10, and 12-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Prior Art

Prior art made of record but not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's

disclosure and consist of two patents.

Art Unit: 3745

Johnson et al. (3,907,120) is cited to show an electro-hydraulic generator having

an immerse pump, and other components inserted into a tank but fails to teach a

circular surface.

LeBlanc et al. (4,573,397) is cited to show an electro-hydraulic generator having

an immerse pump, a filter and other components mounted on a tank but fails to teach.

the components are inserted into a cylindrical volume delimited by a circular surface, a

first plane end face, a second plane end face.

Contact information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Examiner Kershteyn whose telephone number is

(571)272-4817. The examiner can be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 a.m. to

4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Edward Look, can be reached on (571)272-4820. The fax number is 571-

273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(703) 308 0861.

IK

September 12, 2005

lgor Kershteyn Patent examiner.

Art Unit 3745